1: Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

The structure of these larger family groups is transparent; a group 592
of sons reside in houses adjacent to their parents' home, together with the newly established families of the daughters of the house. They share a common livelihood: father and sons work their undivided fields with their wives' assistance; the new son-in-law works with his wife's father until he breaks off to return to his boyhood home. A common residence and livelihood makes for a common hearth, constant association, and the feeling that such relatives form one big family. Undoubtedly the shortage of native women has intensified the situation, but I doubt that it has created a new condition.[1]

Unattached relatives, widowers and widows (*alaid*, also an infre- 592
quent word for spoiled, awry), are found in the households of their near- 736
est blood relatives. Orphans (*kdmdndlaid*, boy; *mdsdlaid*, girl; terms not applied to half orphans) are raised by the relatives of either parent, preferably by a parent's sibling, without prejudice to the interests in the child of the relatives on the other side of the house. Thus, Edgar has lived for several years with Watahomidja, his maternal grandfather, at the same time receiving the gifts of his father's mother and brother.

There is also a tendency toward the formation of still larger groups. 621
This first came to my notice at the dance in 1918, where it was apparent that those from the south end of the village were seated in one group, those from the north end in a second, and families from the central portion formed a third. The division was not absolute, but it was sufficiently marked to be noticeable. The reason for the grouping will appear in the sequel (227, 231), whence it seems that these divisions are the result of relationship and land inheritance, marriage among neighbors, and neighborly interest and cohesion.

Kinship

The individual is oriented among his tribesmen by his relationships. 602
His family is for him a group of kinsmen; beyond them are more distant relatives and in the outer circle the unrelated members of the tribe.

To the question who are kinsmen the answer comes patly enough, 602
blood relatives, but blood relatives are always a group defined by arbitrary 621
limits. This must be particularly true of the Havasupai. Presumably the group never rose in numbers much over 250. I gather that during the last century and a half there were comparatively few intermarriages [648]
with foreign tribes, even with the Walapai. Under these conditions everyone must bear innumerable and comparatively close relationships

[1] I have shown elsewhere (*A Suggested Origin for Double Unilateralism*) how a situation might easily arise from the Havasupai situation.

1:Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

602 to all his tribesmen. Yet only a fraction are recognised as blood relatives, although a community of blood is felt for all. Mark Hanna enumerated 74 persons related to him by blood and 17 relatives by marriage in a population of 177. Jess Cheekapanyega, his nephew, recognised 93 connections by blood and 6 by marriage. Other relationships, of which they were only vaguely aware, came to light while working out the genealogies with them. Terms which express relationship subsume under a single caption a variety of relatives whose actual blood connections differ. I have tried in the following paragraphs to define the limits within which kinsmen are recognised and the relationships in which they are conceived to stand.

601 Relationship terms were obtained from six men and women who
602 should have been competent. Yet all of them fell short of certainty with relationships outside of the immediate family. This was true not only in working over hypothetical cases but with living relatives as well. All hesitated and gave conflicting answers for the cross-cousin's children, for great-grandchildren, and for brother's and sister's grandchildren. This experience is a familiar one and undoubtedly this accounts for the gaps under these headings in Morgan's schedules. Men were less able to give the more remote relationships used by women than were the women themselves. Both Mark and Jess displayed some hesitation in giving the terms by which they addressed those relatives with whom they infrequently came in contact, although they knew readily enough to whom they were related. It was still more difficult for them to give the terms by which these people responded. Both had frequently to confer with their relatives. Apparently the chief reason for this uncertainty
551 lies in the free use of names both in direct address and by way of refer-
601 ence. Kinship terms are comparatively little used and where the relative stands at such remote degree that the blood connection is not obvious there is even a more effective reason for neither learning nor remembering the appropriate designation. This, it will be recognized, is unusual among American tribes, where kinship terms are used more commonly than names.

601

nêyoñgá	father's father
mótigá	father's mother
nágwañgá	mother's father
nágoñ ígá	mother's mother
djñaí ígá, djñá	father
djñji ígá, djñji'	mother
nowígá	father's older brother
nidjañgá	father's younger brother, a woman's male cross-cousin and his son,

1:Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

601 by blood, he prefers to use the blood designation. This applies of course to their wives as well. In all other cases he prefers to use names.

Mark's attitude is different: he noted the reciprocal use of the term *pahamt'ikpd* for every male relative by marriage. While Panamida's wife was still alive Mark called him *pahamt'ikpd:* now he does not use the word. It is interesting to note that while *pahamt'ikpd* is reciprocal, *wiagupa*, a woman relative by marriage, is not, nor is there any correlative expression. Nevertheless the mutual nature of the bond of affinity is recognized. For example, Mark and his brother's wife, Nina, live in the same camp, and both are fully aware that the ties which connect them operate on both alike, yet Mark may address Nina as *wiayápd* whereas she must reply by name. Mark has twelve relatives he calls *wiayápd*, yet not one can use a term expressing her relationship to him.

The genealogical data clearly indicate the limits including kinsmen. 601 Jess does not recognize as blood relatives any whose connections lie back 602 of his grandparents' generation. The same seems to be true of Mark, but I am not so certain of this genealogy. Jess's case is particularly instructive because it eventuated while tracing the inheritance of chieftainship (see the chart, p. 242) that he was related to Sinyella through his great-grandmother. But he was not even aware of any relationship, although Sinyella is a member of his family group and assumes a grandfatherly attitude toward him. He might readily have assumed a number of close relationships, for Sinyella calls Jess's mother *gi'wápd* and is reciprocally addressed as *apá ipá*. At the same time Sinyella is Djerdwaimo's stepfather so that he might have been called father by her and grandfather by Jess. For although step-relatives are not classed as actual relatives, Djerdwaimo often does call her stepbrothers, Melvin and Louis, *gináipd* as well as her half-brothers Lanomea and Dean. Her extension is rather unusual because recognition of kinship generally stops where blood connection ceases. Jess is also related to Big Jim, but neither he nor his father knows what the connection is. The bond must lie back of his grandparents' generation. To cite another instance, Spoonhead and his brothers are half-brothers by their father to Manakadja and Captain Jim, that is, definitely brothers from their point of view, but while Jess recognizes a connection with Spoonhead through the latter's mother, Manakadja is most emphatically not a relative. Similarly James is not a relative, for he is the illegitimate son of Mary, born after she married Bert. Furthermore, Jess's shrewd guess as to the identity of the boy's father did not include any of his own relatives. Nevertheless it must be noted that Bert treats the boy as if he were his son.

1: Spier E-5 (1918) 1928
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

It is also clear that within the kin group collateral lines are merged with the direct line of descent, relatives being equated in the parents' generation. Relatives more than three generations distant are designated by grandparent and grandchild terms. Finally there is little recognition of relatives by marriage. 601 602

I have failed after persistent inquiries to find any trace of special social relations or obligations between those in any two categories, other than the universal relation between parents and children and those between camp mates.[1]

Foreign Indians are sometimes adopted informally as *sulidjkɔd*, a man's older brother's son, or *djikdekɔd*, a man's male cross-cousin, in preference to other relationships. Children of relatives are adopted, but do not assume new relationships. There are no friendship adoptions as at Zuñi, and no ceremonies of adoption. 597 [648]

Marriage

Marriage was normally monogamous, although there were some polygamous unions. One may not marry a blood relative. Should a couple innocently marry and someone later discover that they are related by blood, they would feel ashamed. They would not separate, but people would always condemn their union. There is no notion that monsters spring from such marriages. So much for theory. Crook had lived with Callie for about a month when the old people said that they were related, so they separated. Both have since re-married. From the chart showing the inheritance of chieftainship (p. 242) it appears that Crook's father and Callie's paternal grandmother are cross-cousins. They may be more closely connected through their mothers. My informants were aware that blood relationships are forgotten after a very few generations, and that most, if not all intratribal marriages ignored some remote and unknown degree of relationship. By checking over the agency census with Jess I find that the females, including children, he could not marry were invariably blood relatives, numbering forty-two. Mark said he could not marry thirty-eight women, four of whom were not related to him in any way and five where the recognized bond was one of affinity. For example, he said he could not marry Nina, his younger brother's wife. It turned out, however, that he would not marry one of these women, another was "too fat," and so on. I found no other hint of 588 [590] [588] [684]

[1] Specifically, there is no special relation with the maternal grandfather, as implied, e.g., in some Plateau Yuman tribes. Incidentally it may be noted that in cases of matrilocal residence the maternal grandfather of the children born to a couple is the head of the family group. [592]

592 father, mother, and siblings, included one or both of his paternal grandparents. It might also include paternal uncles, together with their wives and children, and unmarried paternal uncles and aunts. Occasionally, there might be attached to the household other relatives of the child's father, such as a widowed sister and her children, a widowed brother and his children, a divorced brother or sister with or without children, an illegitimate or orphaned niece or nephew, or a sibling of the child's father's parents or grandparents. Despite the range of possibilities in kinship associations in an extended family sharing a common residence, the average number of persons included in a camp 35 years ago was 4.2 individuals (Spier 1928, 210). The composition of the household might include any combination of relatives listed in the foregoing description. The number of persons living in a reservation household in 1951 varied from a mean of 4.9 in July to a mean of 3.7 in December. The largest unit living as one household included 17 individuals, while two households were occupied by lone widowers.

5714 In former times, during plateau residence, a child may have had less
593 contact with those relatives who did not belong to his residence group than
● 602 he has today within the confines of the canyon. But there were even then
621 frequent periods of visiting between related families. Tribal members gathered for dances during the planting and harvesting seasons. Related families ordinarily met for the observance of such rituals as those accompanying birth or death of kinsmen. The small size of the community in Cataract Canyon, after the Havasupai settled more permanently there, brought about an extremely close association between a child and those relatives who did not belong to his camp residence group. All families in the canyon are fairly close neighbors, and children, from an early age, are free to visit about at the homes of relatives and friends.

Kinship

602 An individual professes an equal regard for his paternal and maternal
603 grandparents, but it is frequently confessed that a closer bond is shared with those grandparents who were members of his childhood residence
[591] group. Although residence usually was patrilocal, this was never an inflexible rule, and today there is a trend for young couples to set up individual camps within a few years after marriage, especially if the husband
[548] seeks employment outside the canyon. An illegitimate child, or an orphaned child, is almost always the ward of, or in the residence group of, his maternal grandparents for a part of his life, if they are living. Thus, a child reared by his parents is likely to be more closely associated with his paternal grandparents, whereas a child who lives apart from parents, or
[591] who survives them, is likely to be more closely associated with his maternal grandparents. In accordance with the ideal cultural norms, the paternal grandmother is the one with whom a child resides, whereas the maternal grandmother has the prerogative of performing certain roles in connection with the birth of a child, depending upon the circumstances existing in a particular situation.

Havasupai had traveled to the vicinity of Williams when they sighted an Apache, also on horseback, who had returned to retrieve a bow and arrows he had hidden. The Apache raced away, but his pursuers were too close before he saw them. The Havasupai overtook him, and as they closed in on both sides of the Apache's horse, a Havasupai took a hatchet from his belt and swerved in close enough to land a blow on the Apache's head. The Apache reined his horse, jumped to the ground, and started shooting at the Havasupai, but his bowstring broke. When this happened, he stood awaiting the final blow. One of the Havasupai rode close, swung his hatchet at the man's head, and the Apache fell dead. In anticlimax, informants add that the Apache had been mounted on a stolen Havasupai horse which followed the avenging party home. 721 562

"That old woman was boss of the war party, and she rode right along with the men all the way, even when they killed the Apache," an informant asserted. "She was there when they killed him, but she didn't kill the man herself." It is uncertain whether she actually attempted to, or did, strike any blows at the quarry. Death of the one Apache satisfied the revenge party, which, in fact, probably realized that they would have sustained injuries or deaths themselves had they overtaken the main Apache party.

Special testimony or Advice.

In recording testimony regarding former extent of Havasupai hunting territory preparatory to presenting their case in court, the Havasupai have consulted old women along with old men. This probably was done at the instigation of the law firm engaged by the tribe. 695

Under aboriginal circumstances, it is doubtful whether old women were very frequently consulted on matters concerning the tribe as a group. Most disputes probably were between segments of the tribe or between families. When land disputes arose, it appears that the council of chiefs was consulted if the matter could not be decided otherwise. In this instance, old women would almost never have played a role. On the other hand, if a disagreement were simply argued between families, and women happened to be among the senior members on either side, it is quite possible that they would have taken part in the matter whether or not they were consulted. 695 579 562

At the present time, women in middle age or older are consulted on matters of relationship if marriage is the subject. This is especially true if the woman in question is of advanced age or is reputed to have a good memory. Adult women of any age do not hesitate to add their voices to the cry of public disapproval which arises when any couple attempts to make what is considered an improper marriage. 888 602 582 562

Women play a prominent part in passing on the body of approved social behavior to coming generations, especially in the training of their own sex. 867 562

285
[1415 water bottles are first coated with soap-weed paste colored red, and
534] then with pinon gum to make them water tight.

The real artistry of Havasupai basketry is seen in the coiled trays and bowls, made of twigs of cottonwood or the three-leaved sumac. In shape they vary from round or oval plaques, nearly flat but with slightly upturned margins, to baskets or bowls of cylindrical proportions. The material is prepared at leisure and made into bundles and stored. The bark is scraped from the twigs, the wood split and scraped to uniform width. When desired for use, the materials are soaked in water to make them flexible. The sewing is on a three rod foundation. The ends of three twigs are tied in a knot. One end of the sewing element is pulled under one rod near the knot. The rods are started in a spiral and the binder stitched around them into the middle of the knot. The stitches following those of the first coil are sewed into the knot also. The coils are so arranged that two rods lie along the completed coil with the third on top and between them. The stitch in the succeeding coils is meant to pass under the third rod, but in most cases it pierces this rod which the awl splits. Stitches are evenly spaced to pass between those of the previous coil, not to pierce them. After two coils are in place the end of the rods that protrude at the center are clipped off. Sewing is always from right to left; the free ends of the rods are held in place with the left hand while the right plies the awl. The sewing element is brought over the rod toward the worker and through the coil away from her.

There are two or three methods of finishing the rim of coiled baskets. Usually they are finished by cutting off three rods successively so that the coils will taper to an end. Some baskets are finished with a diagonal over and over stitch with two strands.

531 Simple geometrical figures, animals, and banded designs are made in the black outer side using the outer layer of the seed pod of devil's claw. Most baskets are of white background with black decorations, however, the reverse is sometimes found with baskets of black devil's claw background and white designs.

854 The Havasupai cradle board is an oval frame across which small twigs are laid except at the rounded ends. The frame is made of green branches which are bent, tied and buried in damp soil to set in shape.
[1011 The sticks that are laid across the frame are bound to it by a long strip of buckskin which passes once diagonally over the end of each cross stick. A piece of canvas or buckskin is laid along each side of the frame to cover the wrapping and is held in place by tie loops of buckskin, which are always four in number. Some cradles have carrying straps or a woven Hopi or Navaho belt may be used for the carrying strap, fastened to the frame about one-third of the distance from the top. A hoop of wicker is tied to the frame in the open space at the top and to the upper cross sticks. Two stay straps extend from the center of the upper end of the frame to two points on the hoop. A blanket is usually spread over the hoop to protect the baby's face from the sun and wind and to save him from injury should the cradle board fall.

SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CUSTOMS

594 The Havasupai family in our sense is the social unit. There is no
614 *clan* or *gentes* system, nor are there any indications that they ever ex-
602 isted. Individuals recognize their affiliations with their immediate relatives only; there are no other particular social or ceremonial groups.

The family groups are loosely bound into large ones by blood ties.
593 A group of sons reside in houses adjacent to the parent's home, together with the newly established families of the daughters of the house. The father and sons work their undivided fields with the assist-

8:Service E-8 (1946) 1947
NT14 Plateau Yumans NT14
Havasupai

complexities indicates that factors other than simple familial inheritance rules must also be operative. In order to extract some sense from the obvious instances of inheritance, it was necessary to prepare a community genealogy, and to draft a detailed map showing the location and the proprietorship of each little plot of land; then the history of each of these individual pieces of land was detailed back as far as it was practical. From a study of the mass of this sort of data, it is possible to isolate three main considerations which tend to govern the familial and community decisions in land reallocation.

First, and most obvious, is closeness of relationship. It must be noted in this regard that "closeness" is perhaps better understood here to involve personal closeness and propinquity rather than actual blood relationship, though the two usually tend to be coincident. Thus a relative who lives and works in close harmony with his other relatives is considered nearer than one who lives away.[6] A second factor involves the personal qualities of the heirs, for a high premium is placed on industry and cooperation. A third factor, and an important one, is the relative needs of the persons being considered. Either or both of the second and third considerations often outweigh closeness of relationship.

I shall illustrate these three points with examples and supplementary discussion. When Gattagama died, Crook, his only heir, received all the land. This is a simple case of patrilineal inheritance, father to son. This is the only example of such simple inheritance, however, for this father and only son relationship is unusual.

The second factor, that allocation of land depends to some extent on the personal qualifications of the individual, is often very important. The three men who are poorest in land holdings, Joe Jones, Pete Mulgullo, and Spoonhead, can be cited to illustrate this point. Joe Jones is one of three brothers, but he inherited very little compared to the other two, because it is said, "He was lazy and wouldn't work." Pete Mulgullo never was interested in farming and, when he was younger, preferred to leave the canyon periodically to work for white men instead of helping care for the familial lands. Spoonhead is lazy and also has been regarded as not quite right in the head.

The third factor, need, is frequently decisive in determining which of several claimants to a plot of land will get it, or if several plots are involved, who will get the most. This concern over need operates at all times and it is not unusual that for this reason alone a distant relative of a dead man might get more land

6 See Mischa Titiev, *The Influence of Common Residence on the Unilateral Classification of Kindred* (American Anthropologist, vol. 45, pp. 511-530, 1943).